

## **SEARCH**

### **The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics**

7311 Greenhaven Drive, Suite 145  
Sacramento, California 95831  
(916) 392-2550 ♦ Fax (916) 392-8440  
Internet: [www.search.org](http://www.search.org)

---

# **Technical Assistance Report**

---

## **North Dakota Integrated Justice Planning**

**Site Visit:** October 4-5, 2000

**Report Submitted:** February 8, 2001

**Project Consultant:** Lawrence P. Webster

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction and Request for Assistance.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Background .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Observations and Findings.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. North Dakota has a highly decentralized criminal justice system with organizational, funding, and technology barriers to adequate coordination of technology and information flow .....	4
<i>Organizational Issues</i> .....	4
<i>Funding Issues</i> .....	8
<i>Technology Issues</i> .....	9
2. North Dakota is not yet in a position to pursue a full-scale integration agenda .....	11
<i>Commitment</i> .....	11
<i>Leadership</i> .....	12
3. Despite political, economic, and organizational obstacles, opportunities still exist to improve the electronic exchange of information and coordination of technology .....	12
<b>IV. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>14</b>
1. Build support for the integration initiative .....	14
2. Build a solid infrastructure upon which future applications and integration can be built.....	14
3. Begin to develop additional standards to bring consistency to operations and systems .....	15
4. Work on interfaces where involved organizations are willing and able to participate .....	16
5. Work to structure funding mechanisms to reward those who participate in integration-related projects .....	17
<b>V. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix A: About SEARCH, the National Technical Assistance Program, the Court Information Systems Technical Assistance Project, and the Project Consultant .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix B: Presentation on Integrated Justice, October 4, 2000 .....</b>	<b>23</b>
1. Introduction and Overview .....	24
2. Definition of Integration .....	24
<i>Principles of Integration</i> .....	25
<i>Benefits of Integration</i> .....	26
3. Organizational Commitment and Executive Sponsorship .....	27
4. Organization.....	27
5. Data Policy Issues .....	28
6. Planning .....	29
7. Analysis.....	30
8. Managing the System Long Term.....	31
<b>Appendix C: Meeting and Interview Participants, October 4-5, 2000.....</b>	<b>32</b>

## I. Introduction and Request for Assistance

---

On June 13, 2000, a request for technical assistance (TA) was received from Mr. Curtis L. Wolfe, Chief Information Officer of North Dakota. The request form contained the following description of the services requested from SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics:<sup>1</sup>

“The State needs to develop a comprehensive strategy for statewide information sharing that would focus on the integration of criminal justice components . . . . The State has a real need for an integrated plan and your technical assistance in this endeavor will help ensure our success.”

“We need to involve representatives from state and local criminal justice agencies and use this group to formulate a statewide plan for system integration.”

Through the end of August 2000, there were seven additional contacts between SEARCH and the Information Technology Department (ITD) of North Dakota, with Mr. Wolfe and with Ms. Nancy Walz, Senior IT Business Analyst in the ITD. Some of the discussion related to U.S. Department of Justice grant funding for integration that was being distributed through the National Governors’ Association (NGA). The program provided \$25,000 grants to states for planning integration initiatives, with a promise of additional funding for selected states in future years. The money was to be used, in part, to send a state delegation to one of a series of integration workshops to be sponsored by the NGA. North Dakota applied for and received these funds.

A second purpose for the contacts was to design a TA project that would be helpful in preparing the state for integration, but would not duplicate work being undertaken with NGA funding. SEARCH staff recommended that North Dakota form two committees representative of criminal justice organizations in the state, one with a policy focus and the other with a technical focus. These two committees would meet with the SEARCH TA project consultant on the first morning of the site visit for a presentation and discussion of integration. The project consultant then would meet with the same individuals separately over the next day-and-a-half.

A third purpose was to review and discuss proposed participants in this process — individuals and organizations — who would be invited to attend. The site visit also was tentatively scheduled at this time. Background materials from North Dakota also were to be supplied to the project consultant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Background on SEARCH, the National Technical Assistance Program, the Court Information Systems Technical Project, and the project consultant is included as Appendix A.

The site visit was held on October 4 and 5, 2000. On October 4, the project consultant<sup>2</sup> presented materials on justice system integration planning to the policy and technical committees.<sup>3</sup> During the remainder of the visit, the project consultant interviewed over two dozen individuals.<sup>4</sup> North Dakota officials forwarded follow-up materials to SEARCH staff, including IT plans for state criminal justice agencies; recommendations on the future use of technology in the state's judicial branch developed by the Justice Served consulting group; and materials from the Consensus Council concerning a proposal to form a Criminal Justice Data Board. State IT standards also were downloaded from the North Dakota ITD Web site. The SEARCH project consultant analyzed all of these materials during the preparation of this report.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lawrence P. Webster, Justice Information Systems Specialist in SEARCH's Courts Program (hereafter referred to as the project consultant), was assigned to this TA effort.

<sup>3</sup> These materials are included as Appendix B.

<sup>4</sup> A list of participants in the meeting and interviews is included as Appendix C.

## II. Background

---

North Dakota's criminal justice system consists of dozens of agencies at the state and local levels. State-level organizations playing a significant role in the system were invited to participate in the integration initiative, and most chose to send representatives to the onsite presentation and interviews. These organizations included:

- Office of the Attorney General, Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI)
- Association of Counties
- Courts
- Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (DOCR)
- Office of Management and Budget, Division of Radio Communications (State Radio)
- Driver's License and Traffic Safety
- Highway Patrol
- Information Technology Department (ITD)

In addition, representatives of local criminal justice organizations from the 53 North Dakota counties also participated. They represented:

- Bismarck Police Department
- Cass County Information Services Department
- Fargo Police Department
- Mandan Police Department
- Stutsman County Correctional Center
- Mountrail County State's Attorney
- Traill County State's Attorney

### III. Observations and Findings

---

Over the years, SEARCH has developed a standard methodology to present to states interested in integrating their criminal justice systems. This methodology includes bringing policy leaders from all of the relevant organizations together, developing a definition of integration as it applies to the particular state, securing a commitment from the leaders of these organizations to support the integration initiative, and designing a governance structure that balances responsibility and control between the agencies fairly. Additional steps can include planning for systems integration, analysis of information flow within the state, and consideration of data policy issues, such as security and privacy. This methodology was presented to North Dakota criminal justice system leaders on October 4, 2000, and includes Appendix B.

Because structure, distribution of responsibility among state and local government entities, and barriers to integration vary from place to place, this standard methodology must be customized to fit the circumstances of each state. In some cases, the report of a technical assistance project follows the outline of Appendix B, and amplifies and reinforces the principles and strategies contained therein, with appropriate adjustments to reflect the unique situation of the state.

In the case of North Dakota, it is clear that a significant amount of preparatory work will be required as the state begins to pursue an integration agenda. Organizational, funding, and technology obstacles exist that will inhibit the development of consensus and the level of cooperation necessary for integration to succeed. The observations and findings contained in this section will describe these barriers, along with the many positive conditions that exist in North Dakota that provide hope for a more effective criminal justice system in the future.

#### **1. North Dakota has a highly decentralized criminal justice system with organizational, funding, and technology barriers to adequate coordination of technology and information flow**

The lack of statewide criminal justice information for policy and budgeting purposes is a symptom of a system that is not optimally effective. Although individual agencies often can demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness statistically, many problems are hidden in the gaps between organizations. Only when the full picture is visible is it possible to discern how well the system is performing. This situation was documented adequately several years ago, when the formation of a Criminal Justice Data Board was proposed.

##### **— Organizational Issues**

Political and organizational independence by level of government, by geographical area, and between (and sometimes within) agencies are issues that must be addressed before a statewide integration effort can succeed. Although

separation of powers and a system of checks and balances are bedrock attributes of our constitutional form of government, they complicate the task of integrating criminal justice operations. Coordination and cooperation are a greater challenge with an organizational structure that is as decentralized and diverse as in North Dakota. Some of these issues will be summarized below, along with a few examples that illustrate the magnitude of the problem.

### ***Law Enforcement***

Police departments and sheriff's offices are controlled and managed locally in North Dakota, as they are in most areas of the country. Although having dozens of very small law enforcement organizations in place in a state is not particularly efficient, it provides the services desired and needed by communities. Public safety and law enforcement functions must be coordinated across these political boundaries for the criminal justice system to operate effectively, and when this coordination is lacking, problems can result.

Representatives of law enforcement agencies presented several examples of coordination issues during the site visit. Sheriff's offices use different booking systems that are not capable of exchanging information, and no central warehouse has been created for these data. When county jails hold state and federal prisoners, staff is unable to get necessary information.

Bismarck and Burleigh share a common dispatch system. A study is in progress to determine if Mandan and Morton dispatch should be consolidated with Bismarck and Burleigh. Officers using the consolidated system have expressed frustration with being unable to get through on the radio due to heavy traffic. The installation of mobile data computers and the purchase of an additional radio channel should relieve some of this frustration. Occasionally, different priorities for various agencies make it difficult to implement changes quickly. If dispatch centers are consolidated, a board with 14 members representing the participating agencies will be responsible for decisionmaking and must work together to build consensus if the consolidation is to succeed.

Law enforcement agencies have invested heavily in mobile data terminal (MDT) technology. Because much of this work has been done within the law enforcement community and not coordinated sufficiently with state agencies, data resources that ought to be available to police officers through the MDTs are not there. For example, instead of being able to query motor vehicle files directly, patrol officers must go through the state's Division of Radio Communications (State Radio) for this access. Apparently, Fargo Police Department's MDTs are not even connected directly to State Radio. Investment in MDT technology would yield greater dividends if law enforcement officers were able to access a much wider array of computerized databases from prosecutors, courts, corrections, and others.

The size of Cass County creates unique issues and needs. Automation solutions appropriate for a small agency often do not work in a larger one. Scalability problems between Cass County and the rest of the state were noted at nearly every

level of the criminal justice system. Although some of these issues are political and territorial, many of them are substantive and cannot be ignored if progress is to be realized.

### ***Prosecution***

State's attorneys perform prosecutorial functions in North Dakota. Some are only part-time prosecutors, and many perform these duties from their regular law offices, not from the courthouse. State's attorney operations are county-based, and most are in rural locations with small caseloads. State's attorneys are politically independent, with varying needs, priorities, visions, and resources. It would be unrealistic to expect them to care as a group about a statewide integration initiative, even though they would be among the primary beneficiaries. Most do not need automation and are not overwhelmed by workload. Many would like modern tools to help them do their day-to-day work, but it would be difficult to sell them on solutions that require a sacrifice of independence or that create extra work for which they would see limited direct benefit.

State's attorneys cannot participate in an integration initiative if they are not automated. Efforts by the Attorney General and state's attorneys to create a uniform case management system (CMS) failed. Prosecutor offices in larger counties still could benefit from automation, whether it were an independent CMS or an extension of the courts' CMS.

To make matters worse, state's attorneys in North Dakota are statutorily responsible for disposition reporting to the criminal history repository at the BCI. Electronic disposition reporting, a linchpin of integration, is nearly impossible in a mostly paper environment.

Statewide integration cannot succeed without the significant participation of state's attorneys. If most state's attorneys continue to operate in a manual environment, it will be impossible to move information through the criminal justice system electronically. Delay, redundant data entry, and high error rates will continue to exist. An integration initiative might be possible with only the largest counties included, though uniformity between those systems would be important. The worst-case scenario would be for each prosecutor to have a different system.

Over 20 years ago, independently elected prosecutors in Colorado, acting through their state association, created a uniform CMS that eventually was installed in most counties of the state. In many ways, their situation was similar to that faced by North Dakota today. Strong leadership and individual sacrifice were key to overcoming the political, operational, financial, and technical hurdles. That type of leadership and unity among the state's attorneys does not appear to exist today in North Dakota. There were a couple of key differences between North Dakota and Colorado. The Colorado automation project was driven by a number of large, urban districts that could not operate without computerization. Colorado also has



a district attorney structure with a number of small counties joined under a single, full-time prosecutor, which solved some of the problems of scalability.

### ***Courts***

Courts are often the most difficult organizations to include in integration initiatives. Although they are not a part of the criminal justice system like the police, jails, prosecutors, probation offices, prisons, and other agencies, they play a key role in the criminal justice process. Courts must remain independent and neutral in determining the guilt or innocence of defendants, protecting the rights of the accused, and acting as a check on the power of the state, while making important decisions every day that affect the operation of the system as a whole.

In many states, clerk's offices are county-based; sometimes clerks are independent, elected, executive branch officials. Judges are more often part of a state judicial organization that operates in a completely different administrative environment. Because of the recordkeeping and information processing roles that clerks play for the judicial branch, coordination is essential. Unfortunately, many states have struggled to make this happen because of these structural problems.

North Dakota has shown great vision in bringing clerical support services into the state judicial organization, which eventually will eliminate many of the internal coordination problems. Although the painful transition that is now underway may last for several more years, one of the chief obstacles to criminal justice system integration has been removed.

Several issues in this transition have not yet been resolved, and some are organizational in nature. Responsibility for the processing of restitution and judgments remains to be settled. In some areas, the clerks perform these functions; in other areas, the state's attorneys are responsible. In addition, the issue of having Cass County on a different CMS than the rest of the state must be decided for the courts to complete the transition to a state system.

### ***Corrections***

Although only a couple of minor coordination issues related to organizational structure were noted for the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (DOCR), a review of some of the documents provided to SEARCH revealed symptoms of internal issues that might affect the ability of DOCR to participate in an integration initiative. The fact that the DOCR has four separate IT plans indicates that divisions of the organization may work more independently than would be expected in a state agency. Although the preparation of these plans was coordinated centrally, it seems unusual that separate documents would be prepared.

Aside from the prisoner information problem raised earlier, notification was the only other issue related to organization that was mentioned in the interview. The DOCR operates notification programs, as required by state law, for sex offenders and victims. Corrections officials rely on address information provided by the

state's attorneys, but the prosecutors do not track changes of address of victims and sex offenders, leaving DOCR to try to locate these individuals.

### ***State Issues***

Structure also inhibits coordination of public safety and criminal justice functions at the state level. Three independent officials oversee justice system administration: the governor, the attorney general, and the chief justice. The Highway Patrol reports directly to the governor; State Radio is under the Office of Management and Budget; the crime laboratory, medical examiner, and emergency medical services are in the Department of Health; and the fire marshal and criminal history repository are in the Attorney General's Office. The Department of Transportation (DOT) and the DOCR also report to the governor. Although integration initiatives are not impossible within this type of organizational structure, they are much more difficult to achieve because the priorities and resources of more organizations are affected.

### **— Funding Issues**

Little funding is available to support justice system improvement, and dollars that are provided do not appear to be distributed evenly. Much of what has been accomplished has been done through federal grants, but when grant funding disappears, many of these programs fade away. Maintenance and support of the State's Attorney Management System (SAMS) is an excellent example of a "zombie project" — it has been dead for some time, but is still walking around.

There is no overall agenda for criminal justice system improvement — no strategic plan for addressing the needs of the system as a whole. Instead, there appears to be an assumption that the needs and wants of individual agencies are the only issue, and political influence seems to be the most important factor in deciding who gets what. IT staffing appears to be minimal in nearly every organization involved in the site visit interviews.

A great deal of money has been spent on mobile data terminals for patrol cars, but little has been expended to create or build access mechanisms to the databases for which the MDTs are needed.

Crash information is sent to the DOT on paper. DOT then scans the documents and stores the images, but does not provide access to anyone else. There also appears to be some controversy over who gets to sell this crash data to the public — law enforcement agencies, or the DOT.

Successful integration requires that the major players agree on a joint agenda and budget priorities for improving the criminal justice system as a whole. Political groups competing with one another for scarce resources see little incentive to work together, but by doing so could accomplish much more.

Local, rural organizations never will have the resources to undertake major IT projects on their own. Getting them to band together requires leadership that in many cases can only come from the state level. As with grant programs, the incentives must come with funding if they are to be effective. In other words, integration will only become a high priority if there are financial opportunities associated with it.

By purchasing technology independently instead of working together, North Dakota criminal justice organizations are paying more and getting less for their technology dollars than they should. Limited funding should be a reason to work together on common agendas, not an excuse for not working together at all.

## — Technology Issues

Technology issues can be examined in four categories: Automation, Standards, Infrastructure, and Architecture. As has been discussed previously, automation of key functions is a necessary precursor to integration. Standards for information format and for handling data in business processes also are necessary. For applications to share information, they must exist in a compatible environment with the necessary support staff, tools, and training to keep everything operating. Further explanation and examples of these technology issues are provided below.

### *Automation*

Since integration is defined as the automation of information exchange between organizations, both the sender and the receiver of the data must be operating in a computerized environment. The lack of automation in many small counties could be a problem, but because caseload in these areas is so low, creative solutions are possible. For example, court information in some of these areas is forwarded to larger counties for entry into the statewide CMS. Work by the Association of Counties to provide technology support to rural areas also is very helpful.

The courts are missing some of the key CMS components, most notably financial management functions. Unfortunately, by the time they acquire these capabilities, they could be facing serious obsolescence problems with their applications.

Pre-sentence investigations are performed manually in North Dakota, along with pretrial services functions and progress reporting on probationers. These are critical activities in criminal justice processing, and if some form of automation is not supplied, they could stymie efforts to integrate the justice system.

### *Standards*

A common characteristic of criminal justice organizations in North Dakota is that they develop technology applications without adequate communication with other agencies with which they share information. When data are passed from place to place on paper or by voice over a telephone or radio, the need for coordination is much less important. The application of technology requires more rigorous and rigid processes, because computers cannot deal with ambiguity as humans can.

This does not mean that everyone must store information in exactly the same format or that every organization must conduct business in exactly the same way. It means that each organization must agree on a format for data when it crosses organizational boundaries, one that can meet the data system requirements of each organization. It also means that all of the agencies must agree on the manner and timing of electronic data transfers.

There were a number of examples of the inability to transfer data because systems were developed (or purchased) in isolation, or because agency leaders did not see the need to include these connections in their planning. Sentencing data cannot be moved electronically between prisons and field services in DOCR. The PCSS<sup>5</sup> court CMS in Cass County cannot perform disposition reporting to BCI. The Cass County jail, police department, and municipal court also cannot exchange information. North Dakota's unique process for automatically reducing felonies to misdemeanors upon successful completion of a sentence of less than one year also has been an issue. While flags are provided in the court CMS, communication problems between probation and parole staff and clerks have made the matching of case numbers a problem.

### ***Infrastructure***

The State of North Dakota has done an excellent job building and maintaining many of the parts of its technology infrastructure, while other portions are in a very weak position. SAMS, for example, has suffered from a complete lack of support since grant funding expired. It does little good to develop applications if staffing for software maintenance, training, quality assurance, and problem management are not provided. A related consideration is the age of many of the applications used by state agencies — some were developed with pre-Windows technology.

### ***Architecture***

The North Dakota criminal justice system uses a wide variety of hardware platforms, database systems, and application development languages, with little apparent coordination or vision. A review of state government criminal justice IT plans, for example, shows that the following database management systems receive *significant* use; others also were mentioned in agency plans but are not listed below.

- Attorney General: dBase, Progress, SQL Server, DB2/400, Access
- Courts: dBase, Oracle, SQL Server, Access, DB2/400
- State Radio: Oracle, SQL Server, Access
- Highway Patrol: Oracle, Access, Arc View/Info
- Corrections: Access, Oracle

---

<sup>5</sup> Professional Computer Software Service, Inc. (PCSS) is the vendor that supplies case management software to some of the North Dakota counties.

In addition, local law enforcement has adopted different standards for MDTs, and there is no standard office suite for state government. Personal computers have been installed throughout the state for child support functions, but have not been integrated with other applications.

Because it is necessary to use software and hardware applications for many years to recoup investments that were made in their development or purchase, any organization will have a variety of systems in use at any time. If applications are not replaced when they become obsolete, if a number of small systems are developed in place of a single larger one, or if no high-level plan or architecture has been adopted, then the proliferation of systems will continue unchecked. The greater the diversity and complexity of the technology environment, the more difficult it is to support it, and to share criminal justice information effectively and economically.

## **2. North Dakota is not yet in a position to pursue a full-scale integration agenda**

Aside from the barriers discussed in the previous finding, two other factors will impede progress with integration. They are primarily political in nature and include a lack of commitment by policy leaders and a lack of leadership to drive the project forward.

### **— Commitment**

Integration requires a strong commitment from all key players in the criminal justice process. While integration cannot succeed without this support, it can fail easily if opposed by one significant group in the system. States that have succeeded with integration have developed more of a corporate mentality for managing criminal justice; they pursue a common agenda, rather than individual ones.

Representatives of a number of agencies were concerned that the state's attorneys in North Dakota have the political power to stop change, and have demonstrated their desire to preserve the status quo on many occasions in the past. On the other hand, state's attorneys described how politics at the state level killed a proposal to create a coordinating body for criminal justice information several years in the past.

It is clear that operational-level staff, supervisors, and mid-level managers feel an urgent need to connect the technology tools that are currently in use in North Dakota, but until there is a stronger commitment on the part of policy leaders in all three branches of government, success will be limited. It is not enough to have the support of state government alone; local governments, at least in the larger counties, also must be committed.

## — Leadership

Many of the comments made by interview participants reflected a positive attitude about working across organizational boundaries to solve these problems, but also showed a sense of frustration with past efforts. Although most viewed the commitment of their own organizations as being satisfactory, they were critical of other agencies and seemed to doubt that current circumstances ever could be changed. For example:

“There is a lot of focus on what cannot be done.”

“Do as little as possible to avoid getting burned.”

“We are doomed to failure with integration because people won’t share data.”

What is missing is leadership on this issue. As long as integration is an operational and technical issue that is pushed by rank-and-file government workers, there will always be hesitancy, uncertainty, and lack of trust. Integration must become a policy issue championed by political leaders.

### **3. Despite political, economic, and organizational obstacles, opportunities still exist to improve the electronic exchange of information and coordination of technology**

Despite the lengthy enumeration of barriers to integration listed in the previous section, there are a number of positive factors that provide the State of North Dakota hope for success. In many ways, North Dakota’s technology infrastructure may be one of the greatest assets to this effort. An analysis of technology plans for criminal justice organizations provides evidence of the hard work of ITD in developing standards for hardware, software, and management processes. Although funding limitations will delay full realization of the benefits of these standards for many years, the creation of standards is an important step in the right direction.

The fact that the Association of Counties provides IT support to small, rural counties helps to mitigate many of the problems of North Dakota’s widely scattered population by making it possible to reach a large number of counties through a single organization. While counties maintain their independence, the development costs for new applications are shared, making technology support more affordable for these rural areas.

Another very unusual and extremely beneficial factor is that the state and counties share a telecommunications network. Dealing with dozens of different networking

schemes could be a nightmare for those working on an integration project, but having a single network eliminates one dimension of complexity.

The IT planning process in North Dakota allows the coordination of activities between state agencies and organizations, monitors progress in complying with standards, and ensures accountability in the use of IT resources. This coordinated planning, under the leadership of ITD, will facilitate future progress with criminal justice system integration.

As previously mentioned, recent actions to bring county-based court support staff into the state judicial branch removes one of the greatest barriers to integration. The most significant steps toward building a unified state court system have been accomplished, although additional work remains.

Technology staffing levels in criminal justice organizations are minimal, while the quality of staff is higher than in many other parts of the country. Organizational competence with technology is not always a given in state government, and having capable workers is another factor that will benefit North Dakota's efforts to integrate criminal justice system operations.

It was noted in a previous section that many of the technology applications employed in the criminal justice system were developed or acquired without coordinating with other organizations. This is certainly true, but it must be said that there are a number of high-quality products in use in various organizations. It is certainly easier to modify good products for automated data exchange than it is to fix bad ones.

Despite the independent nature of government organizations in North Dakota, it also must be noted that there are many examples of successful cooperation in sharing information. For example, the Highway Patrol noted that it works well with the courts and DOT. Several other agencies also mentioned that working with the DOT was a positive experience.

Even though circumstances make a major integration initiative a difficult task at present, there are particular information exchange relationships that are ripe for automation. A recent review of court activities by the Justice Served consulting group, for example, listed a number of court interfaces as being high priority, including connections with the DOT and BCI. The recent election of a new governor and attorney general also provide opportunities for revisiting many important issues that will help further criminal justice integration in North Dakota.

## IV. Recommendations

---

The following recommendations are based on the observations and findings listed in Section III, and are preparatory to a large-scale integration initiative. They are organized into five levels that can be pursued concurrently.

### 1. Build support for the integration initiative

Without the enthusiastic support of all of the organizations that comprise the criminal justice system, success with an ambitious integration agenda is not possible. Although it will take time to build this support, much can be done to progress in the right direction until all of the key organizations are ready to proceed.

To address political and organizational issues, the State of North Dakota should create a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, comprised of the policy leaders of all state criminal justice organizations, and representatives of local government agencies (through their state associations, where they exist). This coordinating council will serve as the integration governance structure. The SEARCH Web page, at [www.search.org](http://www.search.org) provides sample statutes, rules, orders, and memoranda of understanding that have been used to establish similar groups in other states.

This Criminal Justice Coordinating Council will foster communication, commitment, cooperation, and consensus in the justice system, and will provide leadership in building an integration agenda, as described in Appendix B. Because of the pivotal role of technology in criminal justice system operations, the ITD and Association of Counties also should be members of this group.

One of the first responsibilities of the council would be the creation of an integration plan for the State of North Dakota. This plan would serve as a common agenda for the criminal justice system at the state and local levels, and would drive the integration initiative forward in the future.

### 2. Build a solid infrastructure upon which future applications and integration can be built

Infrastructure means different things to different people. In the context of this report, infrastructure includes computing platforms, database systems, communications networks, office automation software, application development environment, support staff, standards, and security. It is the environment in which user application operates.

ITD has done an excellent job of defining standards in most of these areas. Unfortunately, lack of funding has kept many state organizations from being able to upgrade their systems to comply with these infrastructure standards. Another issue is that the state standards still give organizations a great deal of choice —



freedom to use Word or WordPerfect; Notes or Exchange; Novell or NT; Oracle, DB2, or SQL Server; etc. Because of the diversity of organizations and applications supported by ITD, this is necessary, but the criminal justice system will require tighter standards. These standards must be set by consensus, which will not be an easy task.

The infrastructure standards established by ITD are supported by the recommendations of this report. A statewide TCP/IP<sup>6</sup> network environment, relational databases, Web-based applications, and data warehouse technology will support integrated justice applications. To the degree that state and local agencies can agree on specific development languages and database packages, integration will be even easier. Specific infrastructure standards development for the criminal justice system should be a responsibility of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, working with the ITD and Association of Counties. The council should establish a technical committee to work out details and make recommendations.

### **3. Begin to develop additional standards to bring consistency to operations and systems**

Data standards should be a high priority of the North Dakota criminal justice system. Offense coding schemes, personal and case identifiers, and other data that flow between organizations must be understood in a common way for electronic information exchange to make sense.

A question was raised during the on-site interviews concerning the use of social security numbers in the justice system. At present, there are restrictions placed on asking individuals for their social security numbers, for publishing them, or for releasing them to the public. In child support cases, for example, the social security number must be redacted before case documents can be made public. Current law does not appear to restrict the use or exchange of a social security number with other criminal justice agencies, once it is known. Recent activity in the Congress, however, suggests that further restrictions on use of the social security number may occur in the future.<sup>7</sup> It is recommended that data standards developed in North Dakota define alternate methods of identifying offenders.

Functional standards also are important to the integration initiative. Uniformity is not a problem because state-level applications exist in one place. Because law enforcement, jail, and prosecutor operations are county-based, it is important that their systems be as similar as possible. It is unrealistic to expect local governments to agree upon uniform software, but if these systems are functionally equivalent and can provide data to other organizations in a manner consistent with state data standards, then they are not a barrier to integration.

---

<sup>6</sup> Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol.

<sup>7</sup> Privacy and Identity Protection Act of 2000 (S.2876 and H.R.4611), Social Security Number Protection Act of 2000 (S.2699), Social Security Number On-line Privacy Protection Act of 1999 (H.R.367), and Amy Boyer's Law (S.2554), to name a few. None of these bills was passed by the 106<sup>th</sup> Congress.

Work is beginning at the national level to adopt functional standards for software support systems throughout the criminal justice system. Some court standards are already nearly complete.<sup>8</sup> While it will require several years to finish this work, North Dakota can benefit by monitoring progress and adapting these national standards for use in the state.

Many of the technical standards that will be required to support an integration initiative already have been published by the ITD. Cooperative work with local governments to refine the technical standards and to increase compliance will be an important focus in the future.

#### **4. Work on interfaces where involved organizations are willing and able to participate**

Given the lack of automation in the state's attorney system, it seems clear that the state would benefit if responsibility for disposition reporting were moved to the courts. The judicial branch is moving toward a uniform, statewide case management application, while the prosecutors may never approach this ideal.

A simple Web-based application could then be created to allow prosecutors to report declinations to BCI, a piece that will be missing if the courts take over disposition reporting, and to perform inquiries into state databases. Using emerging eXtensible Markup Language (XML) standards,<sup>9</sup> state's attorneys in remote locations could participate in integration using a standard World Wide Web browser.

SAMS should be supported or discontinued. The politics of the situation should not be used to justify something that makes no sense economically. In the same vein, transition to the Uniform Court Information System (UCIS)<sup>10</sup> should be completed as quickly as possible. Even though Cass County will lose some functionality in the transition, the need for uniformity is more important. Supporting one system is a great enough challenge for the courts; to divide their resources to support two may cause neither to be viable in the future.

Batch processes currently are used to exchange information between some systems. The DOT copies information to the courts monthly, and DOCR provides a nightly batch update to the BCI. This is better than not exchanging information at all; however, online connections would be a better alternative. This would provide access to current information and avoid the need to maintain the same information in two places.

---

<sup>8</sup> See [www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/CTP/Index.html](http://www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/CTP/Index.html).

<sup>9</sup> See the proposed standard rap sheet at [www.legalxml.org/IntegratedJustice](http://www.legalxml.org/IntegratedJustice).

<sup>10</sup> UCIS is the case management software used by the North Dakota court system.

An alternative approach would be to follow the example of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It has a statewide TCP/IP network that has data warehouses located at each major state criminal justice agency for information from legacy systems. Agencies make copies of their databases each night and place them in the data warehouses. They have created an XML-based messaging system that links the databases together and provides some creative new functionality for agencies in remote, rural parts of the state. Once again, this would allow agencies to view criminal justice information with a PC, Web browser, and connection to the state network. There also is tremendous potential for providing expanded database access to MDTs in police cars.

## **5. Work to structure funding mechanisms to reward those who participate in integration-related projects**

The California judicial branch recently has undertaken an interesting approach to encouraging standardization, as they are creating a state-funded court system from one that was primarily supported by cities and counties. This approach might be a valuable model for the North Dakota criminal justice system. First, a high-level IT plan was created that placed infrastructure building as the highest priority, followed by case management systems, then other more specialized court technologies. Local and regional areas were given an opportunity to create their own plans, using the state plan as a model. Funding decisions were made based on the state-level priorities, so the local court infrastructure needs were given primary attention, followed by upgrades and replacement of case management systems. Little funding remained after the first year to pursue other technology issues, but with basic infrastructure and recordkeeping systems taken care of, more money would be available for advanced technologies, like electronic filing, in future years.

North Dakota could use a similar approach. After an integration plan is created, funding allocations for state agencies could be based on how well they helped judicial and executive branch agencies move in the direction of full compliance with the plan. Distribution of grant funds for state and local governments also could be based upon the priorities of the plan. This would provide a stronger incentive to build the infrastructure and comply with the standards that are necessary for integration to succeed. At present, the state IT standards are nearly silent on the subject of considering the information needs of other organizations in making technology acquisition decisions.

## V. Conclusion

---

The goal of this project was to provide a strategy for criminal justice system integration, leading to the development of a plan. It is clear there are numerous organizational, funding, and technology barriers that must be overcome for this to occur, but the primary issues that must be addressed are organizational commitment and leadership. Until there is consensus that integration is a high-priority agenda item for the entire criminal justice system, it will be difficult to obtain the support and funding required. Until policy leaders from these organizations are seated at the same table discussing these issues, progress will be incremental, sporadic, and slow.

Integration will provide significant benefits to the citizens of North Dakota. Once the policy leaders of the criminal justice system agree to work together more closely, which is a sacrifice of independence, the entire system will make more rapid progress and serve and protect the public better.

Appendix A:  
**About SEARCH, the National  
Technical Assistance Program,  
the Court Information Systems  
Technical Assistance Project,  
and the Project Consultant**

## **SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics**

SEARCH is a nonprofit membership organization, created by and for the states, which is dedicated to improving the criminal justice system through better information management and the effective application of information and identification technology. Since 1969, SEARCH's primary objective has been to identify and help solve the information management problems of state and local justice agencies confronted with the need to automate and integrate their information systems, and to exchange information with other local agencies, state agencies, agencies in other states, or with the Federal government. SEARCH's headquarters are in Sacramento, California.

SEARCH provides justice agencies at the local, regional, state, and federal levels with diverse products, services, and resources, including:

- No-cost, expert technical assistance for agencies in the process of acquiring, developing, upgrading, or integrating their computer systems.
- Hands-on training designed to teach criminal justice investigators and support staff how to investigate high-technology theft and computer-related crime.
- National conferences and symposia on a range of justice information management technology and policy issues.
- A variety of on-line resources, including databases of IT procurement documents and criminal justice software, information on law enforcement IT resources, and profiles of state activity in the areas of integration and incident-based reporting.
- Information management policy assistance programs to help states expand the utility of their criminal history records.
- Significant, nationally disseminated publications that document legal, policy, and statistical research on a range of relevant issues affecting operational justice agencies, and development of national information models and standards, including security and privacy standards and a model rap sheet format.

### **SEARCH Online Resources**

SEARCH provides a wide variety of information about justice information systems, related technologies, standards, research, and technology acquisition via the Internet and World Wide Web. In addition, SEARCH offers access to criminal justice policy research, including electronic newsletters and briefing papers, automated research databases and documents, and hypertext linkages to relevant research data. All of the Web sites can be accessed via the SEARCH home page at [www.search.org](http://www.search.org).

## **The National Technical Assistance Program**

The National Technical Assistance Program, administered by SEARCH with funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), provides no-cost assistance to all components of the state and local criminal justice system with respect to the development, operation, improvement, or integration of all types of criminal justice information systems (e.g., records and case management, computer-aided dispatch, criminal history record systems, etc.).

The Technical Assistance Program includes both in-house and on-site technical assistance. In-house technical assistance includes consultation with agencies via telephone, mail, and electronic network (Internet and World Wide Web). These technical assistance projects can include consultations and information about automation, integration, and planning issues, as well as review of agency automation/integration planning materials, needs assessments, data modeling, and requests for proposals.

On-site assistance helps agencies in their efforts to effectively plan for, design, develop, procure, and implement computerized information systems, and can involve the following: conducting needs assessments; identifying system requirements; developing or reviewing site-specific planning documents; planning projects to achieve integration of information systems across functional and/or political boundaries; assistance in writing technical proposals; providing technical consultations on a wide range of operational and policy issues; proposing solutions to system problems; locating expertise and information systems for transfer; and guiding the transfer and implementation of systems and techniques to improve information management.

## **The Court Information Systems Technical Assistance Project**

The Court Information Systems Technical Assistance Project is a national effort that focuses on developing practical resources for state and local courts in their efforts to automate and integrate information systems, both within the courts and between courts and other justice agencies. The project is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. DOJ, and is a partnership of SEARCH, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the National Association for Court Management (NACM), and the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA).

These courts need special assistance to address the policy, operational, and technical issues associated with the development or implementation of new automated, integrated information systems. This project provides expert and practical advice, guidance, and assistance to courts and justice agencies that are automating, upgrading, and integrating their information systems. The project offers two types of no-cost assistance:

— In-house assistance provided at SEARCH headquarters in Sacramento,

California, or by NCSC in either Williamsburg, Virginia, or at its Court Services Division in Denver, Colorado, or via written correspondence, telephone consultations, or electronic mail. This provides courts and justice agencies with immediate access to the specialized knowledge of professional staff, as well as referrals to technical resources.

- On-site technical assistance provided to courts and justice agencies. This helps agencies effectively plan for, design, develop, procure, and implement a computerized information system. The range of assistance includes such processes as needs assessments, system requirements, integration planning, technical proposal preparation, operational and policy consultations, and system transfer.

## The Project Consultant

**Lawrence P. Webster** is a Justice Information Systems Specialist with the SEARCH Courts Program. He previously served as Delaware's State Court Administrator; Executive Director of Court Technology Programs at NCSC; Director of Data Processing for the Utah courts; System Manager for the U.S. Attorney, District of Colorado; and Manager of Operations and Development for the Colorado District Attorneys Council.

He has delivered more than 85 seminars, presentations, and courses related to technology in the justice system and has headed or participated in more than 70 research, education, and consulting projects. He prepared a commissioned paper for NACM's Symposium 2000 titled *How Can Court Leaders Use Technology to Address the Justice Needs of a Multicultural Society in the 21st Century*; drafted the NACM *Information Technology Management Core Competency Curriculum Guidelines*; was the principal author of *A Guidebook for Electronic Court Filing and Automating Court Systems*; and has prepared or assisted with more than 40 other books, articles, and papers.

Mr. Webster holds a Master of Science in Judicial Administration degree from the University of Denver College of Law, is a fellow of the Institute for Court Management (ICM), and is a graduate of ICM's Court Technology Certificate Program.



**Appendix B:  
Presentation on  
Integrated Justice,  
October 4, 2000**

The following is a summary of information that the project consultant presented to the policy and technical committees at the beginning of the site visit on October 4, 2000.

## **1. Introduction and Overview**

Integration of criminal justice information systems has become a high priority of state and local government throughout the nation. This desire to integrate systems has been driven by several factors, including growing user needs, greater public expectations, improved information and security technology, and major federal initiatives.

User needs have grown as the quality and capabilities of internal automation and other technology tools have improved. As agencies experience success and as more sophisticated systems become available, they become more confident and desire to perform more functions with technology.

Because technology is reaching into many new areas, the public is becoming more comfortable with it and is increasing its expectations. More access to criminal history records for nonjustice purposes is being sought and granted, and the public, in general, seems to believe that criminal justice information systems are already integrated.

Information and security technologies have progressed to the point that concern about risk has diminished significantly. The emerging Internet communications protocols and user interfaces have become de facto standards for technology of all types. Data warehousing, middleware, and standard application architectures also have contributed to new opportunities for applying technology tools for the advantage of the criminal justice system.

Two major federal initiatives also are driving state and local governments toward integration. The *Crime Identification Technology Act* (CITA) has provided millions of dollars of direct and indirect support for integration at the state level. The creation of the Global Criminal Justice Information Network, an advisory committee to the U.S. Attorney General, has brought representatives of executive and judicial branch organizations together to discuss and set standards for information exchange.

## **2. Definition of Integration**

The best way to understand what integration means is to understand what it is not. In today's terms, integration does not mean forcing all criminal justice agencies to use a common information system or to keep all of their data in the same place. It also does not mean opening up sensitive databases to the public or to other organizations. Integration is not sharing everything, nor is it sharing information with other agencies that has not been shared in the past.

Information is essential to the operation of the criminal justice system. In order to control crime, protect the public, enforce the law, maintain order in society, and treat offenders appropriately, each action and decision must be documented carefully. The exchange of that information is equally important, since a variety of organizations that play different roles in the justice process are mutually interdependent. Without complete, accurate, and timely information, decisionmakers cannot make correct choices.

Most criminal justice agencies do a good job of managing information internally. They have created business processes and technology tools that help them do their work more effectively and economically. The problem is that these organizations have created these systems in isolation and they do not match up with one another. As long as data are exchanged on paper, and as long as the telephone and radio are available to clear up misunderstandings, information can be moved from one organization to another and from one automated system to another. The problem is that this takes a tremendous amount of time, the labor costs are excessive, and the process is rife with error. Because of the increasing mobility of criminals and growing volume and complexity of cases, manual data exchange cannot deliver information to decisionmakers quickly enough to make a difference.

Integration is the automation of this information exchange process. It is the connection of systems internally, horizontally, and vertically in the criminal justice process so that information can move from place to place almost instantly, providing information to decisionmakers in a timely manner, reducing error, and eliminating the cost of human involvement.

The problem is that moving information gathered in one format for a specific purpose to another organization that must use it for a different purpose and in a different format is extremely difficult. Computers impose a much higher level of detail and a more rigid structure on business processes. Humans can interpret these differences and transform data with little effort; these tasks are nearly impossible for computers to perform reliably. Computers struggle to resolve ambiguity through context; only when a programmer can anticipate every possible combination and permutation of outcomes, can automated data exchange occur.

The simple solution is to develop standard methods of representing information and agreed-upon processes for exchange, which can nearly eliminate ambiguity. Once these standards are defined, the process of creating the connections and computer programs to pass and receive data is straightforward.

### **— Principles of Integration**

A number of key principles are important if a common understanding of integration is to be shared throughout the North Dakota criminal justice system.

- Data acquisition is expensive and error-prone — redundant data entry should be minimized or eliminated. This can create burdens at the front

end of the process, as agencies must do more work to ensure that the information they capture meets the needs of downstream users.

- Integration should be driven by existing operational systems, not by separate systems created solely to support integration. This will minimize labor requirements, cost, and error rates.
- No state has solved all of the problems and is doing integration perfectly — data exchange must be automated incrementally, but with an overall plan to ensure that short-term activities are taking the criminal justice system in the proper direction.
- Integration is a strategic issue — it will require multiple budget cycles to complete, and its effects will span many organizations.
- Integration involves cooperation between organizations with sometimes conflicting or competing objectives. This makes commitment and leadership essential.
- Integration is like a marriage — it takes all partners working together to achieve success, and only one organization refusing to cooperate to make it fail.
- The criminal justice system cannot operate effectively with paper — decisionmakers must have all the information about individuals and events to make correct choices.

### — **Benefits of Integration**

It should be clear at this point that integration is not easy to accomplish; many projects have failed because these principles have not been followed. The benefits of integration are so great that it is worth the effort. Benefits of integration include:

- Improved information quality
- Better decisions because of more and better information
- Elimination of error-prone and redundant data entry
- Timely access to information when it is needed most
- Elimination of barriers of time and space — “24/7” access
- Improved public access to appropriate data
- New functions that can be performed by systems, such as automatic notification of appropriate officials if the status of an offender changes
- Greater efficiency in business processes
- Enhanced public safety
- Increased public trust and confidence in the justice system

### **3. Organizational Commitment and Executive Sponsorship**

Perhaps the most important success factor in integration initiatives is the support of criminal justice policy leaders. There should be no question to anyone in any of the involved organizations about the seriousness of the commitment to integration. This dedication should be formal and documented, and well communicated throughout the organization.

All participating agencies in all branches of government should sponsor the effort jointly. A partnership is being created to solve information flow problems quickly and permanently; shared responsibility and ownership of the project will help ensure support by all levels of staff. It also will generate enthusiasm, focus energy, and ensure accountability.

A memorandum of understanding, statute, or other formal agreement should be created to serve as a charter for the integration initiative, and all judicial and executive branch representatives should sign it. This document should contain a specific, high-level scope statement; it should set a date for the completion of a detailed plan and other key milestones; and it should assign responsibility for the next steps in the process.

### **4. Organization**

States undertaking integration must face a multifaceted array of political, organizational, legal, technical, cultural, and personal issues, including constitutional separation of powers and competing conflicting objectives of participating organizations. Difficult decisions must be made for the good of the project, even though they may be difficult for some organizations to accept. For this reason, a governance structure must be created that distributes responsibility, work, and decisionmaking fairly between criminal justice system components. Typically, this governance structure consists of the policy leaders of the major participating organizations.

This governing group has many functions and responsibilities, including:

- Providing project leadership
- Developing a common understanding of problems, obstacles, and barriers
- Instituting a joint approach to policy, planning, funding, architecture, and legislative changes
- Creating a unified vision, mission, objectives, and project plan
- Formalizing agreement on scope of effort by organization, transaction, etc.
- Obtain needed resources
- Resolving technical and operational problems that cannot be handled at a lower level

- Committing internal agency resources
- Keeping the project on schedule
- Monitoring progress and identifying and resolving problems quickly

Other work groups and committees may be formed to deal with technical and operational issues, but it is essential that high-level sponsorship of the integration initiative continue throughout the difficult journey. It is important that they also be representative of all of the organizations that have a stake in the issues they are created to address. Some of the responsibilities of these other groups could include:

- Providing information on legacy systems and current procedures
- Analyzing and recommending exchange points to automate
- Identifying and articulating technical and operational issues
- Analyzing and improving business processes
- Analyzing and recommending technical solutions
- Recommending, negotiating, and maintaining standards
- Determining resource needs

## **5. Data Policy Issues**

Because different criminal justice organizations treat information in various ways, it is important to resolve data policy issues very early in the project. For example, law enforcement agencies may be unhappy if courts release information to the public that police departments consider confidential. These situations can create friction and confusion, causing coalitions to crumble. Examples of some of these issues include:

- Privacy
- Confidentiality
- Data ownership
- Security
- Public access
- Data dissemination

Managing data policy issues is the responsibility of the policy level group. It may establish a committee of staff from interested agencies to analyze problems and make recommendations, but should make all final decisions.

## 6. Planning

The statewide integration plan represents the joint commitment of all involved. It should outline tasks, assignments, schedules, budgets, and deliverables for the integration project, within the overall goals of the formal charter adopted by the governing group.

The plan must be realistic. Objectives can be written into a plan, but that does not mean they can be completed within the projected time and resources. Experience is the best teacher as to what can be accomplished realistically.

Specifics of the plan should include a number of key elements that are discussed below. States may be required to address additional issues as well.

Architecture and infrastructure are an important precursor to integration. Passing information between applications residing in the same environment and constructed with the same tools is much easier and less costly than creating custom interfaces between character-based mainframe systems and graphical client/server systems. This is particularly true in a distributed environment where information is scattered over dozens of systems in remote parts of the state. It should be apparent that if the communications capabilities to exchange data between systems are not available, they must be created before any meaningful progress with integration can be made.

The project plan also should contain an analysis phase. This includes a detailed mapping of all data exchange points — operational processes where information crosses organizational boundaries. This issue is discussed in more detail in subsection seven, below.

Once the State of North Dakota has a roadmap of all of the criminal justice data exchange points, decisions can be made about which transactions to automate. Certain exchanges happen routinely, in high volume, while others are infrequent and vary considerably in content. Integration efforts should focus high-volume, time-sensitive transactions that will increase staff productivity and the quality of justice system decisions.

In order to ensure that information will flow smoothly between organizations, it is necessary to establish data standards. Organizations that share information must agree on the format and editing criteria for all data elements exchanged electronically, to protect the integrity of systems. The best example is offense coding. Either everyone must agree to use the same charge-coding scheme, an approach that has been difficult, but successful in many states, or they must agree on a charge translation table. If the criminal justice system agrees on standard data structures and edits, integration is a much easier task.

Once these agreements are complete, work can begin to modify software and operational procedures so that implementation of electronic data exchange can

begin. Programs must be written, new equipment may be necessary, and training will be required before new processes can be deployed and tested.

A detailed planning document for the policy group should include:

- Tasks to be completed
- Commitment of current resources
- New resources required
- Schedule
- Measures of success
- Communications plan

Data exchange points can be automated individually, but there must be an overall plan for the effort to succeed. Of course, having a plan is not enough. Effective project management methodology will ensure that plan objectives are accomplished.

## **7. Analysis**

As mentioned, a thorough analysis of information exchange between criminal justice organizations is essential to the success of an integration initiative. By simply bringing agency staff together to review information flow, many states have been able to make dramatic process improvements. Although most employees have a general understanding of how data are passed between organizations, very few grasp the details.

SEARCH has been working for some time on a data exchange points project. Staff has collected information from five state criminal justice systems, and is in the process of conducting an analysis of that data to understand similarities and differences. The global model of data exchange that will emerge from this project will assist states their internal evaluation efforts and save considerable work.

The project describes data exchange points in terms of the agencies participating in the exchange, the event and process that trigger the exchange, the actual information that is passed, and the conditions that may cause variations in the process. For example, a felony arrest and a misdemeanor arrest may trigger the creation of different forms and may involve different organizations.

As a part of this project, SEARCH has created an information-modeling tool that can facilitate the analysis of data exchange in the states. It is Web-based software, so agencies can contribute information from remote locations without special software or hardware. Enhancements to the software are currently being completed, and the tool should be available for use within a couple of months.



## **8. Managing the System Long Term**

The State of North Dakota also must consider how to keep the integrated justice system operational once it is up and running. There is a tendency for policy leaders to lose interest and move on to other things. As elected leaders and support staff change, maintaining the commitment to integration is particularly challenging.

One lesson learned in another state is the importance of maintaining the proper roles among the various committees that were created to support integration. If policy group meetings degenerate into technical discussions, policy leaders will quickly stop attending and send representatives in their place who do not have the clout to hold the group together. The frequency of policy-oriented meetings can be reduced to a bare minimum to keep from losing agency leaders who are so important to the process.

**Appendix C:  
Meeting and Interview  
Participants,  
October 4-5, 2000**

## **October 4, 2000, Integration Presentation (attending and invited)**

- Mike Abel, Association of Counties
- Kenan Bullinger, State Laboratories Department
- Marcie Conmeyer-Fisher, Stutsman County Correctional Center
- Dean Dahl, Grand Forks County
- Warren Emmer, Department of Corrections
- Wade Enget, Mountrail County State's Attorney
- Jerry Fossum, Information Technology Department
- Ted Gladden, Supreme Court
- Lynn Heinert, Driver Improvement Services
- Robert Helten, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Joe Herslip, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Robert Holmbeck, Cass County
- David Huhncke, Department of Corrections
- Dave Kleppe, Highway Patrol Headquarters
- Marsha Lembke, Traffic Safety
- Peter Mariner, Fargo Police Department
- Hope Olson, State Laboratories Department
- Carrie Oswald, Highway Patrol Headquarters
- Stuart Peterson, Traill County State's Attorney
- Chuck Placek, Division of Field Services
- Harlan Pratt, Fargo Police Department
- Kurt Schmidt, Supreme Court
- Cher Thomas, IT Division, Office of the Attorney General
- Terry Traynor, Association of Counties
- Tim Turnbull, Bismarck Police Department
- Judy Volk, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Jess Walker, Mandan Police Department
- Nancy Walz, Information Technology Department
- Jeff White, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Curt Wolfe, Information Technology Department

### **October 4, 2000, Interview Participants**

- Mike Abel, Association of Counties
- Marcie Conmey-Fisher, Stutsman County Correctional Center
- Wade Enget, Mountrail County State’s Attorney
- Lynn Heinert, Driver Improvement Services
- Robert Holmbeck, Cass County
- Stuart Peterson, Traill County State’s Attorney
- Harlan Pratt, Fargo Police Department
- Peter Mariner, Fargo Police Department
- Terry Traynor, Association of Counties
- Tim Turnbull, Bismarck Police Department
- Jess Walker, Mandan Police Department

### **October 5, 2000, Interview Participants**

- Warren Emmer, Department of Corrections
- Jerry Fossum, Information Technology Department
- Ted Gladden, Supreme Court
- Robert Helten, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Wes Henderickson, State Radio
- Joe Herslip, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- David Huhncke, Department of Corrections
- Jerry Kemmett, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Dave Kleppe, Highway Patrol Headquarters
- Carrie Oswald, Highway Patrol Headquarters
- Chuck Placek, Division of Field Services
- Kurt Schmidt, Supreme Court
- Tim Schuetzle, State Penitentiary
- Cher Thomas, IT Division, Office of the Attorney General
- Judy Volk, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Nancy Walz, Information Technology Department
- Jeff White, Bureau of Criminal Investigation
- Curt Wolfe, Information Technology Department